ಗಳ ಬಂಧು ಮಿತ್ರರಿಗೂ ಮತ್ತು ನೇಪಾಳದ ಪ್ರಜಾ ಜನರಿಗೂ ಕೊಡಲಿ ಎಂದು ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನೆ ಮಾಡಿ, ಇದು ವರೆಗೂ ನೇಪಾಳಕ್ಕೂ ಮತ್ತು ನಮ್ಮ ದೇಶಕ್ಕೂ ಯಾವ ಮಿತ್ರ ಬಾಂಧವ್ಯ ಇತ್ತೋ ಅದೇ ಮಿತ್ರ ಬಾಂಧವ್ಯ ಇನ್ನು ಮುಂದೆಯೂ ಇರಲಿ ಎಂದು ಹಾರೈಸಿ, ದಿವಂಗತರ ಆತ್ಮಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ನಿಮಿಷ ಕಾಲ ಎದ್ದು ಗೌರವವನ್ನು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸೋಣ ಎಂದು ಸಲಹೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

*Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM (Jagalur).—Sir, I associate myself with the Minister for Public Works and endorse the feelings of sorrow he has expressed at the passing away of King Tribhuvan. He was the Ruler of our neighbouring State. He was a true and trusted friend of India and he helped in maintaining cordial relationship between India and Nepal and I am sure this relationship which was established by him will continue indefinitely to the good of both countries. I and the members of our Party and the Members of this House feel very deeply for this irreparable loss. The sense of sorrow of this House may be conveyed to the members of the bereaved family.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Chair also likes to associate itself with the sentiments and feelings expressed by both the Minister for Revenue and Public Works and the Hon'ble the Leader of the Opposition. I had the good fortune of having personal contact with him. He was a very enlightened Ruler. He had the great ambition of introducing far-reaching reforms in his country It is a great loss not only to Nepal but also to India. I request the Hon'ble Members to rise and stand for one minute as a mark of respect to the departed soul.

(*The Members stood in silence for one minute.*)

ADJOURNMENT MOTION

re Message rate system for Telephones.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Yesterday, I had received an adjournment motion. The adjournment motion reads like this :

"This Assembly do now stand adjourned to discuss a definite matter of urgent public importance and of recent occurrence, to wit, the situation arising out of the introduction of the Message Rate system for telephones in the City of Bangalore which has come into force since the midnight of 15th of March 1955."

Sri Mulka Govinda Reddy has brought this adjournment. Has he got anything to say ?

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY (Chitaldrug).—Mr. Speaker, Sir, the adjournment motion that you just now read out was tabled by me yesterday. It refers to a definite matter, that is, the message rate system that has been introduced for telephones in Bangalore and it is a matter of recent occurrence, because it was introduced from the early hours of 16th March 1955. It is of public importance because it concerns the businessmen, merchants, colleges, government, press, legislators and everybody who is interested, and, much more than that, it concerns the City of Bangalore where the seat of Government is situated. So, it is a matter of great public importance.

1 P.M.

Sir, formerly when this telephone system was run by the Government of Mysore by its own department, that is, by the Electrical Department, people of Bangalore were paying Rs. 10 as a rental per month. After 1951, it was integrated with the Post and Telegraph Department and after some time the rental was increased from Rs. 10 to Rs. 24 ; and now they have introduced this message rate system. Though they have reduced the rental from Rs. 24 to Rs. 10, the message rate system indirectly is going to be a hevay burden on the owners of telephones. And apart from that, it is going to be a heavy burden on those who use telephones without having the telephones in their names ; it is going to affect the Legislators as well not only during the sessions but also during other times when we come and stay in the Crescent House or in any of the Guest Quarters. We may like

(SRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY.)

to speak to our friends over the telephone or we may like to contact the departmental head or anybody in the public interest. So much so, we will be prevented from using the telephone; otherwise we will have to pay the bill which may amount to Rs. 50 or Rs. 60 per month.

Sir, there is nothing to criticise the policy of this Government in this respect, I concede. But the hardship, the inconvenience that it is going to cause to the public in Bangalore I would like to bring to the notice of the Government, because Government is also interested in this as they are also using more than 400 telephones in Bangalore and will be obliged to foot a very big bill. I therefore plead that, for the reasons that I have just now stated, they themselves admit the admissibility of my adjournment motion. I therefore plead that this matter may be taken up.

(*Sri A. Bheemappa Naik rose.*)

Mr. SPEAKER.—Only with regard to admissibility or otherwise, you may speak.

***Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK** (Molakalmuru).—Though I feel like Sri Govinda Reddy in the matter that it is going to cause inconvenience to many people, I do not know whether it could be discussed on an adjournment motion, because this was announced about one month back and we knew the date on which it would come into effect. More than that, it is not really the Government of Mysore that has passed this order, but it is an act of the Central Government. After all it is not an occurrence or a matter which has recently occurred or any such thing in the strict sense of that word. It is an order passed by the Government and it has come into effect on a certain date. It is a matter which relates to the Government of India; therefore, it cannot be discussed on an adjournment motion. However, I feel that we ought to ventilate our grievances in some other form but that could be done by a cut motion or some such thing just to send our recommendation to the Central Government. In fact the Chamber of Commerce and many other organisations have protested against this levy. It has merely cut our pocket to some extent; all that I can concede. But we will be setting up a bad example if that matter is taken up as an adjournment motion.

***Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM** (Jagalur).—It is true that the local Government are not responsible for the introduction of this Message Rate System, but I do not know whether the local Government was consulted by the Government of India before this drastic change was made. This is a matter in which the local Government is vitally interested and as one being interested in the welfare of the citizens of the State, I think, they cannot entirely dissociate themselves from this measure which has affected the entire public.

And again, Sir, Sri Bheemappa Naik has pointed out that this cannot be a matter of adjournment motion, because an adjournment motion amounts to certain kind of censure. But this has not been brought forward as a censure towards the Government but only to plead through our Government that such things are done to the prejudice of the people and also against the system of Government. If there is no delicacy or if there is no difficulty or legal obstacle to admit this adjournment motion, I would plead, Sir, that in the longer interest this may be allowed as a Special Resolution. I think the Hon'ble Speaker has got that power to allow the Special Resolution to be discussed in this House. I am not concerned with this motion, I am concerned with the relationship between the State Government and the Centre. Of late, the Central Government, irrespective of the welfare of the State's people, irrespective of the reaction of the people, they are behaving—I must use a very strong word—very dictatorially, imposing their own laws in all such vital matters. I think, it is obligatory on them to consult the local Government and if necessary local legislators. Number of such things have happened. They have levied fresh burden on the people. The existing practice has to

be changed. A time has come when we have to ventilate our grievances and to assert ourselves and we have to protest to the Central Government by all constitutional means. So in that light, I would request the Chair and also the Government in their own interest—in all such matters we are one and it will not be a party issue—to allow this motion as a Special Resolution to be discussed. How far can the Government act as *ex parte* and impose fresh pieces of fiscal measures on the State people? So, I plead, it can be taken up as a Special Resolution and many a time it has been done so, and a date may be fixed for that purpose.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA (Minister for Home and Industries).—Sir, the Message Rate System has been introduced just about 24 hours ago. By this time, we are fully aware that Bangalore is not the only place that has got this system.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—Bangalore is having 3,000 telephones and in Bombay and Calcutta they are having 10,000 telephones.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—We are all aware that Message-rate is to be found in almost all the important cities of India. As the House is well aware of, and as was mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition, it is a subject with which the Centre alone has exclusive right of registering or passing any order. However, Sir, I am not entering into the merits or the demerits of this system, but there is a feeling in the State, ever since it was announced that this Message Rate System would be introduced, that it will not be in the larger interests of the State; especially the commercial people, banking people and various other industrial concerns, have come to feel that this system is not in their interest. This Government have no objection to bring as forcefully as possible to the notice of the Central Government the intense feeling of the State regarding the hardships that are said to be caused or about to be caused by the introduction of this system. I do not think, that beyond that it would be possible for us to do anything under the circumstances. Moreover, we cannot sit in judgment here and then say by means of an adjournment motion as to what should be done. However, I entirely agree with my Hon'ble friend Sri Mulka Govinda Reddy that this is a matter which will have to be brought to their notice. I give an undertaking to bring it to the notice of the Central Government and tell them that they may reconsider their decision if possible. Beyond that Sir, I do not think that all the matters raised by the Leader of the Opposition can be tagged on for discussion on this subject, *viz.*, the issues of fiscal matters and all those things. That is a matter that may be considered later on. But so far as the present question before us now is concerned, I feel, with this assurance from me, the mover of the adjournment motion will be pleased to withdraw or will not press it.

Mr. SPEAKER.—What does the Hon'ble Minister say, supposing a special resolution is brought up by the Leader of the Opposition?

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Now the point is this: even with regard to a Special Resolution, the manner in which the resolution is put, the mode of putting it and various other things will have to be taken into consideration. If it is purely in the form of a representation, it serves no purpose in my opinion. I entirely agree with the Hon'ble Member so far as the position as explained by him is concerned. I am not disputing that. There is a feeling that by the introduction of the Message Rate System, the commercial world especially the people dealing in commerce, are likely to suffer more. Regarding its actual working, it is not even 24 hours old, and we cannot yet say whether it will cost Rs. 50 or more a month. There was a very nice article in *Janavani* yesterday when this Message Rate System was introduced, about how everybody was saying "hallo! hallo! what about the rate of chillies, what is this thing, and all these things" and similar avoidable talks would be avoided. We shall wait and see.

Mr. SPEAKER.—One other important thing is, the Central Government should also know the feelings of this House. Therefore in what form it can be discussed, is a point to be considered.

* Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO (Minister for Law and Education).—So long as the Central Government functions under the control of the Central Legislature to which this subject pertains, it would be very difficult for us to discuss it here. Even the present discussion is sufficient to indicate the volume or the strength of opinion in the matter. I do not know whether we would be competent to take up the question as a special subject, but we might consider that, Sir.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—I personally feel, so far as the public opinion in the State is concerned, it has been expressed by the Hon'ble Member who tabled this adjournment motion. We also find in the press and various other forms or modes in which public opinion is expressed that the country does not seem to relish this matter. I would certainly bring this to the notice of the Central Government through the concerned Ministry (*A Voice*: Were you consulted?) No. We were not consulted.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—There is another important point which the Government should know before informing their views to the Central Government, that is, the members will ventilate their grievances and the Government will be in a position to know, before their decision is conveyed to the Central Government, the views of the House or the public. Therefore if it is not in the form of an adjournment motion, in some other form it may be brought up and discussed; as rightly pointed out by the Leader of the Opposition, it may be permitted as a Special Resolution. If it is an adjournment motion, there would be a tinge. I do not like it to be discussed on an adjournment motion, but it can be allowed as a special resolution and about half an hour may be allotted for discussion.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Then the Special Resolution will be taken up on the non-official day so that it may not interfere with the Government business.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Anyhow, the suggestion will be carefully considered by the Government and we will be informing the Chair about our views tomorrow.

Mr. SPEAKER.—We shall take it up tomorrow.

Sri R. ANANTARAMAN (Chamarajapet).—Did not the Government protest Sir?

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—We did not propose to protest, Sir.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—What about the adjournment motion, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER.—It has not been disposed of; it will be taken up tomorrow.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Even the question of admissibility or otherwise of the adjournment motion is not disposed of?

Mr. SPEAKER.—No.

BUDGET FOR 1955-56—DEMANDS FOR GRANTS.

Cut motions.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM (Jagalur).—Regarding the cut motions, you remember, Sir, this is the first time it has been agreed to by both the parties that none should move the cut motions and we will speak on the demand itself and it has a healthy effect. After two subsequent days, there was no discussion and the cut motions that were tabled. . . .

Mr. SPEAKER.—It was not so. In fact only some cut motions were selected and the concerned Hon'ble Members spoke on them.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—But today, Sir, the members of my party with the consent of the Treasury Bench, have come to an understanding, subject to the ratification by the Whip, that we need not move any cut motions at all and we will speak on the demand. Because, we have to deal with a very important subject *viz.*, Education; we have also divided the subjects on which we have to speak. I will be speaking on the financial aspect;